

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the present application. The Examiner has previously acknowledged Applicants' election of claims 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15, while claims 1-8, 11, 14 and 16-21 are withdrawn. Claims 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 have been rejected. Claims 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 have been amended. Claims 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 remain for consideration upon entry of the present response. Support for the amendments may be found at least in FIG. 9 and pages 19-20 of the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of the claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Uehara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,659,376, hereinafter "Uehara"). The Examiner states that Uehara discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims, primarily in FIG. 12 and column 10, lines 16-17. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reason stated below.

FIG. 12 of Uehara relied upon by the Examiner discloses that the liquid crystal panel 101 is applied with a rubber-type adhesive 151 applied to the whole periphery surrounding the opening 150a so as to stop the opening 150a. (Col. 10, lines 15-18.)

Thus, Uehara does not disclose, teach or suggest "the particle interceptor having **at least one recess**" as recited in independent claims 9 and 15. Furthermore, the Examiner does not particularly point out where Uehara discloses the particle interceptor 151 having at least one recess.

Uehara further discloses that the fixing plate-supporting member 152 and the fixing plate 150 are spaced from each other with a certain gap which is filled with an elastic member 154 so that the fixing plate 150 is hanged in space by the fixing plate-supporting member 152 via the elastic member 154. (Col. 10, lines 29-33.)

Uehara does not disclose, teach or suggest “the second supporting member frame portion being vertically extended directly from the first supporting member frame portion” as recited in amended independent claims 9 and 15.

Lastly, FIG. 12 of Uehara discloses a large gap between the fixing plate support member (i.e., second frame supporting member frame portion) 152 and a side face of the liquid crystal panel 101. In addition, FIG. 12 of Uehara discloses the rubber adhesive 151 in contact with the bottom portion 101b and an elastic member 161 in contact with a top portion 101a of the liquid crystal panel 101 to fix the liquid crystal panel 101.

Uehara does not disclose, teach or suggest “the second supporting member frame portion **fixing** the liquid crystal display panel” as recited in independent claim 9 and 15.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9 and 15, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 10, 12 and 13, define over Uehara.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 9, 10, 12, 13 and 15 under § 102 be withdrawn.

Claims 9, 10, 13 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Niibori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,808,707, hereinafter “Niibori”). The Examiner states that Niibori discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims, primarily in column 13, lines 21-32 and column 15, lines 45-46. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reason stated below.

FIG. 19 of Niibori relied upon by the Examiner discloses that the liquid crystal panel 1 is applied with a rubber-type adhesive 8 applied to the whole periphery surrounding the opening 150a so as to stop the opening. (Col. 13, lines 20-25.)

Thus, Niibori does not disclose, teach or suggest “the particle interceptor having **at least one recess**” as recited in independent claims 9 and 15. Furthermore, the Examiner does not particularly point out where Niibori discloses the particle interceptor 8 having at least one recess.

Lastly, FIG. 19 of Niibori discloses the liquid crystal panel 1 resting on the vertical extension or second supporting member of the frame portion 17 and does not

disclose that the side face of the liquid crystal display panel facing the inner side face of the second supporting member frame portion, as claimed in claims 9 and 15. In addition, FIG. 19 of Niibori discloses the rubber adhesive 8 in contact with the bottom portion of the LC panel 1 and an elastic member 11 in contact with a top portion of the liquid crystal panel 1 to fix the liquid crystal panel 1.

Niibori does not disclose, teach or suggest “**a side face of the liquid crystal display panel** that is to be mounted on the liquid crystal display panel supporting member **facing an inner side face of the second supporting member frame portion,** **the second supporting member frame portion fixing the liquid crystal display panel,** **the particle interceptor having at least one recess**, as recited in independent claims 9 and 15.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 9 and 15, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claims 10, 12 and 13, define over Niibori.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection to claims 9, 10, 13 and 15 under § 102 be withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

On page 8 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner concludes that Uehara discloses in FIG. 12 that the second supporting member frame portion 152 along with the first supporting member frame portion 150 and 154 combined helps to support and hold the liquid crystal panel 100P, therefore, the second supporting member frame portion 152 is considered to fix the liquid crystal panel.

It is respectfully submitted that this analysis is flawed in that “fix” means to make firm, stable, or stationary. (See m-w.com) and that the claim language of claims 9 and 15 explicitly states “the **second** supporting member frame portion **fixing the liquid crystal display panel.**” The second supporting member frame portion 152 of Uehara does not fix the liquid crystal panel 100P, as FIG. 12 depicts a vast space between the side of the liquid crystal panel 100P and the second supporting member frame portion 152.

Further, Applicants acknowledge that claims 9 and 15 do not require that the second supporting member frame portion having to be close to or even in contact with the side of the liquid crystal panel so as to fix the liquid crystal panel. However, claims 9 and 15 do require “the **second** supporting member frame portion **fixing the liquid crystal display panel.**” (Emphasis added.)

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants’ attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants’ attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick
Reg. No. 43,801
Confirmation No. 7126
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115

Date: January 17, 2008